

REMARKS

Claims 11-18 are pending. Claim 11 has been amended. No new matter is added.

Claims 11-19 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arras et al. (U.S. Patent 5,323,453) in view of Charland (U.S. Patent 5,661,776) and further in view of Hill et al. (U.S. Patent 3,978,292). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the claimed invention, one user (or a group of users) is chosen and the current on a subscriber line is limited to a maximum value in the connection phase, the current is reduced after a waiting time to a standard value, the procedure is then repeated for the next user (or groups of users) until all the users are supplied. Thereby, the maximum value I_{\max} of the sum of all supply currents, which determines the dimension of the power supply, is reduced.

Referring to claim 11, the Examiner asserts that Arras discloses, at col. 1, lines 31- 36, connecting one of the users to the energy source. However, this actually states that energy is supplied to the magazine of a telephone exchange module from the main network, via a convention current supply unit. Thus, Arras does not actually state that at the beginning of new connections, only one user is connected to the energy source and also does not state or suggest that the high initial current is supplied for only one subscriber at the same time.

Arras et al. describe in column 4, lines 54-66: "FIG. 1 illustrates " However, Arras fails to disclose or suggest that only one user after the other is connected to the power supply and supplied with an initial feed current limited to a maximum value.

The Examiner asserts that Arras discloses supplying an initial feed current limited to a maximum value (see cot 5, line 55 - cot 6, line 8). However, Arras actually discloses two different characteristics for the feed current and the possibility to select one of them. The supply current of Arras is limited by the (electronically generated) resistors 32A, 32B (Fig. 4 col. 6, lines 2-9 and col. 5, lines 22-30).

The Examiner next asserts that Arras discloses limiting the feed current to a standard value (col.5, lines 47-54) given an error free user line and after a waiting time (see col.6, lines 38-53). However, according to Arras (col. 5, lines 47-54) two different feed currents are supplied and parameters are monitored (see col. 6, lines 38-53). However, the change to a reduced standard current is caused by the user (temperature for example, see abstract or col. 3, lines 49-60). Thus, Arras does not disclose the claimed waiting time.

The Examiner asserts that Arras also discloses successively repeating the method for additional users (col. 6, lines 54-59). However, Arras actually describes a situation when all of the users are already supplied. There is no suggestion that a new connection is started and that only one of the users receives the maximum initial current I_{\max} . Arras describes a power feed, where the current is reduced when for example the temperature exceeds a certain value or the subscriber line is very short. According to the claimed invention, the user is fed with a limited high value initial current for a certain time and then switched automatically to a reduced current. This avoids the disadvantages of Arras, namely:

1. The necessary time for activating a function while receiving the high initial current is not fulfilled before the arrangement switches back to a reduced current;
2. A higher current than necessary is supplied to the user, which causes temperature problems;
3. The temperature, etc., has to be monitored;
4. The capability of the power supply of Arras cannot be minimized.

The Examiner admits that Arras fails to disclose that the method for the feed is a remote feed and relies on Charland as teaching this feature. Charland discloses a device for sequentially testing a communication line. Charland et al. do not teach "a method for the remote feed of a number of simultaneous users (col. 2, lines 1624) as the Examiner asserts. Charland teaches a device for sequentially altering the conditions of a (only one) communication line (col. 2, lines 23-25). Charland does the testing by altering the conditions of one communication line using different

switches 34-43, which are sequentially activated (col. 2, lines 28-31). There would have been no motivation to combine the teachings of Arras with the teachings of Charland because sequentially testing one communication line does not relate to reducing the maximum current of a power supply. Further, recharging the remote power supply module by a voltage (col. 5, lines 51-55) does not lead to the claimed invention.

The Examiner also admits that Arras in view of Charland does not explicitly disclose the method in which the feed current is reduced to a standard value, and repeating the method for users that are additional users. However, the Examiner asserts that one of ordinary skill would have been motivated to seek a method in order to work with the actual method taught by the Arras – Charland combination and that such method would have been any known ringing current control such as disclosed by Hill. Applicants respectfully submit that this is an improper basis for combining the cited references.

First, as asserted above, the combination of Arras and Charland does not in fact teach or suggest the claimed invention. Further, a combination of Arras and Charland would be a combination of a power supply with reduced current and a device for sequentially altering a communication line for remote checks. The claimed invention is not realized by this combination,. In other words, the combination fails to disclose that only one user is fed with the high start current, that after a waiting time the current is reduced to a reduced standard value and that following the next user is fed with the high start current.

Further, Hill teaches a TDM ringing system. The limitation of a power supply is not even mentioned in Hill and is not necessary because the ringing pulses are arranged like TDM signal pulses superimposed to a DC current. A certain time slot is reserved for a certain pulse is available at the same time. It is unnecessary to consider the resulting current of different supplier currents having different values. A combination Arras with Charland and Hill would be a combination of a power supply with reduced current and a device for sequentially altering a communication line for remote checks and a TDM ringing control circuitry. Different problems are solved by different solutions in each of these references. Thus, there is no hint to combine these references and a combination does neither lead to the successive supply of a high but limited supply start current nor

to the automatically switching to a reduced current after a waiting time. Therefore, claim 11 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 12 is allowable at least due to its dependency from claim 11.

Claim 13 recites “disconnecting a user that continues to use the maximum value of the feed current after the expiration of the waiting time.” Hill does not connect and disconnect the user from their power supply. Only the ringing impulse is fed to the user (connected) or not fed to the user (disconnected). This function is part of the LG1 - LG4 apparatus at the user and not a part of a central power supply.

Claim 14 recites “allocating the maximum value of feed current after the expiration of the waiting time, wherein a current reserve is available.” As discussed above, Arras fails to disclose or suggest a waiting time.

Claim 15 recites “limiting the feed current of the user to the standard value after the waiting time.” Hill, in Fig 2, shows two states, current and no current. Hill, at col. 4, lines 5-11 describes a signaling procedure. According to Hill, the ringing generator is superimposed on negative 48V from battery B. The battery is responsible for the power supply. There is no disclosure or suggestion that the supply current from battery is limited to a standard value after a waiting time. Hill is not concerned at all with the power supply and only deals with signaling.

Claim 16 is allowable at least due to its dependency.

Referring to claims 17 and 18, Arras calculates the control current I_{con} for one line. The claimed invention calculates the maximum sum I_{rmax} of all supply currents delivered by the power supply. The calculated current in Arras is not equivalent to the maximum sum I_{rmax} of all supply currents delivered by the power supply.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. 449122030500.

Dated: June 27, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By Deborah S. Gladstein
Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7753
Attorneys for Applicant